The Woman's Protest

Published Monthly by the National Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage
35 West 39th Street, New York City

Vol. 2
No. 6

APRIL
1913

"SOME IDEALS OF THE SUFFRAGE" SHATTERED

PERTINENT QUESTIONS

THE WOMAN'S REBELLION

SITUATION IN ALL STATES

SOCIAL REVOLUTION

SUFFRAGIST "TEMPERANCE"

WASHINGTON

Subscription, $1.00 a Year

Single Copies, 10 cents

Entered as Second-Class Matter, May 1, 1912, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y.; Under the Act of March 3, 1879

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

National Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage

35 West 39th Street, New York City

OFFICERS

President, Mrs. Arthur M. Dodge, New York.
Vice-Presidents, Mrs. Henry P. Kidder, Boston, Mass.; Mrs. John B. Herron, Pittsburg, Pa.; Miss Anne MacIlvaine, Trenton, N. J.
Recording Secretary, Mrs. Eli Whitney, New Haven, Conn.
Treasurer, Mrs. Robert Garrett, Roland Park, Baltimore, Md.
General Sec'y, Miss Minnie Bronson.

BOARD OF DIRECTORS

Miss Mary S. Ames, Boston, Mass.
Miss Alice Hill Chittenden, New York.
Mrs. Horace Brock, Philadelphia, Pa.
Mrs. Rowland G. Hazard, Peacedale, R. I.
Mrs. Daniel A. Markham, Hartford, Conn.
Mrs. Frank Goodwin, Washington, D. C.
Mrs. Herman M. Hubbard, Columbus, O.
Miss Anna Dayton, Trenton, N. J.
Miss Jane U. Rutherford, Richmond, Va.
Mrs. A. T. Dudley, Exeter, N. H.
Mrs. Brookes Brown, Burlington, Vt.

State Associations Opposed to Woman Suffrage

CONNECTICUT

Office: 209 Pearl St., Hartford.
President, Mrs. Daniel A. Markham.
Vice-Presidents, Miss Elizabeth Burnell, Mrs. Charles C. Beach, Miss Martha J. Wilkinson.
Treasurer, Mrs. Albert S. Cook.
Secretary, Mrs. Walter S. Schulz, Hartford.

ILLINOIS

President, Mrs. Caroline F. Corbin.
Vice-Presidents, Mrs. R. J. Oglesby, Mrs. James M. Walker, Mrs. T. B. Blackstone.
Treasurer, Miss J. C. Fairfield. Dearborn Avenue, Chicago.
Recording Secretary, Mrs. George W. Kretzinger.

IOWA COMMITTEE

President, Mrs. Martin Flynn.
Secretary, Mrs. Simon Casady, 715 Prospect Road, Des Moines.

MARYLAND

President, Mrs. Robert Garrett.
Vice-Presidents, Mrs. Francis T. Redwood, Mrs. John Haslup Adams, Mrs. Arthur B. Kinsolving, Miss Catharine M. Selfe.
Corresponding Secretary, Miss Katherine P. Davis.
Recording Secretary, Mrs. Claude Hall.
Treasurer, Mrs. Charles B. Penrose.

MAINE COMMITTEE

Secretary, Mrs. Sidney W. Thaxter, Portland; Mrs. Charles S. Ogden, Mrs. James P. Baxter, Mrs. Clarence H. Corning, Mrs. F. A. Quimby; Miss Louisa Spring, Miss Catherine P. Talbot, Miss Hannah L. Talbot, Miss Mary King Longfellow, Miss Elinor S. Moody, Miss Marion Richmond Weeks, Mrs. John M. Glidden, Newcastle; Mrs. P. M. Blake, Bangor; Mrs. F. C. Robinson, Brunswick.

MASSACHUSETTS

Office: 687 Boylston St., Boston.
President, Miss Mary S. Ames.
Vice-President, Mrs. J. Randolph Coolidge, Miss Anna L. Dawes, Mrs. Charles E. Guild, Mrs. Charles D. Homans, Miss Agnes Irwin, Mrs. Henry M. Whitney.
Treasurer, Mrs. James M. Codman.
Recording Secretary, Miss Elizabeth Johnson.
Corresponding Secretary, Mrs. Charles P. Strong, Boston.

MICHIGAN

President, Mrs. Henry F. Lyster.
Vice-Presidents, Mrs. L. E. Clark, Mrs. C. A. Kent, Mrs. Charles W. Casgrain, Miss Stella Ford.
Treasurer, Mrs. James Cosslett Smith.
Secretary, Miss Helen E. Keep, 753 Jefferson Ave., Detroit.
Corresponding Secretary, Mrs. William S. Jerome.

NEW HAMPSHIRE ASSOCIATION

President, Mrs. A. T. Dudley, Exeter.
Vice-Presidents, Mrs. Edson J. Hill, Concord; Mrs. Thomas C. Bethune, Concord; Mrs. Will B. Howe, Concord; Mrs. Barrett Wendell, Portsmouth; Mrs. John R. Spring, Nashua.
Recording Secretary, Mrs. Otis G. Hammond, Concord.
Corresponding Secretary, Miss Grace Morrill, Concord.
Treasurer, Miss Carry R. Todd.

NEW JERSEY

President, Miss Anna Dayton.
Vice-Presidents, Mrs. Grover Cleveland, Princeton; Mrs. Thomas Craven, Salem; Mrs. Alexander F. Jamieson, Lawrenceville; Mrs. C. Ledyard Blair, Bernardsville.
Corresponding Secretary, Miss Fanny Dickinson, Trenton.
Recording Secretary, Miss Anne de B. MacIlvaine.
Treasurer, Mrs. Charles Minnegorode, 192 West State St., Trenton.

NEW YORK STATE

Office: 35 West 39th St., New York
President, Miss Alice Hill Chittenden.
First Vice-President, Mrs. Arthur M. Dodge.
Vice-Presidents, Miss Eleanor G. Hewitt, Mrs. Fritz Achelis, Mrs. George Douglas Miller, Mrs. William P. Northrup.
Honorary Vice-Presidents, Mrs. Elihu Root, Mrs. Richard Watson Gilder, Mrs. Francis M. Scott.
Secretary, Mrs. M. E. Loomis.
Treasurer, Mrs. Charlton T. Lewis.

OHIO

President, Mrs. Herman M. Hubbard.
Vice-Presidents, Mrs. Joseph Crane, Dayton; Mrs. W. W. Clippinger, Madisonville; Mrs. John M. Gundry, Cleveland; Mrs. Helen M. Lucas, Marietta; Mrs. Frank Ray, Granville; Mrs. H. E. Talbott, Dayton.

PENNSYLVANIA

Office: 261 So. 15th St., Philadelphia.
President, Mrs. Horace Brock.
Vice-Presidents, Mrs. Frank Samuel, Mrs. William W. Birdsall, Miss Sophy D. Irwin, Mrs. James Large, Mrs. William L. McLean, Miss Mary Newhall.
Treasurer, Miss Elsie Balch.
Corresponding Secretary, Mrs. Brinton Coxe, 1515 Spruce St., Philadelphia.
Recording Secretary, Mrs. Charles Bingham Penrose.
General Secretary, Miss Laura M. Sloan, Philadelphia.

RHODE ISLAND

President, Mrs. Rowland G. Hazard.
Vice-Presidents, Miss Louise C. Hoppin, Mrs. Howard O. Sturges, Mrs. Stephen O. Metcalf.
Secretary, Mrs. A. G. Harkness.
Treasurer, Mrs. Elisha H. Howard. Newport Branch.
Hon. Chairman, Mrs. Joseph Howland.
Chairman, Mrs. Charles Weaver.
Secretary, Mrs. Ernest Howe.

VERMONT.

President, Mrs. Brookes Brown.
Vice-President, Mrs. George W. Wales.
Secretary, Mrs. M. H. Buckham, Burlington.
Treasurer, Mrs. Clarence Morgan.
Executive Committee, Mrs. G. G. Benedict, Mrs. Addison B. Buell, Mrs. Merritt D. Chittenden, Miss Bertha Terrill.

VIRGINIA.

President, Miss Jane M. Rutherford.
Vice-Presidents, Mrs. Thomas Cary Johnson, Mrs. Charles Whitlock, Miss Annie Rose Walker, Mrs. Arthur Wilmer.
Secretary, Mrs. Charles M. Ferrell, 1616 Grove Avenue, Richmond.

WASHINGTON, D. C.

President, Mrs. Frank Goodwin.
Honorary Vice-Presidents, Mrs. Elihu Root, Miss Jane Riggs, Miss Mollie Eliot Seawell, Mrs. George Wickersham, Miss Grace Denio Litchfield.
Treasurer, Miss McMullen.
Secretary, Miss C. L. Harrold, 2101 N. St.

WISCONSIN.

Madison Branch.
President, Mrs. Frank W. Hoyt.
Treasurer, Mrs. Joseph W. Hobbins.
Corresponding Secretary, Miss Genevieve Mills, 222 Monona Avenue, Madison.

"SOME IDEALS OF THE SUFFRAGE" SHATTERED BY SEARCHING ANALYSIS

By Archibald Hopkins

SOMETIME ago there was published in the "New York Evening Post" an article entitled "Some Ideals of the Suffrage" which has been reprinted and is put forward by Suffragists as a conclusive argument in their favor. In it the long-received basis and justification of the prevailing system is ignored. It may be well to recur to it. It has been briefly stated by the late President Mark Hopkins of Williams College, who says:

"We have thus the family as the unit of society. We have government as necessarily representative. We have a right in all the members of society to representation; to protection in all their rights; to be governed rightly. We have also the two grounds on which persons have been called on to take part in the government: responsibility for personal service, and the support of the government by their property. With these elements we inquire whether the right of suffrage should be extended to woman. The question is not whether she has a natural right to vote, for none have that, but whether her own elevation and best influence, and the ends of society require that that right should be bestowed upon her.

This question has been discussed as if the sexes constituted different classes, and as if there were, or could be, in their real interests, a conflict between them. That is a great mistake. A man and his wife are not of a different class; and their interests, together with those of their family, are identical. The very existence of society, indeed, depends on men and women as entering into a special relation which not only unites their interests, as in a partnership, but identifies them, and makes each sex reciprocally the guardian of the other. The cases where this relation does not exist are strictly exceptional, and society is not organized, and does not exist for exceptional cases.

This question, therefore, should not come in the form of a partisan discussion, but of a mutual inquiry what the rights of a woman are, and how she may be elevated to the highest point in culture and legitimate influence. And upon such an inquiry man should enter with no less alacrity and candor than woman, for if there be anything which must react with swift retribution upon society, it is any needless ignorance or degradation of its wives and mothers.

The family, as has been said, is the unit of society. This character of it should be, and unconsciously is, one of the most cherished objects of Christian civilization, and unhappy will be the nation whose legislative mind shall regard society simply as a mass of individuals, and not as a combination of families. The family being regarded thus, as a divine institution sufficing for itself, and society being regarded as a combination of families, society will have a double life, or rather, its one life will be within two spheres. There will be the domestic life of the family and the public life of society. Of these the family is the more important and sacred, and over this in its domestic life, it is the duty and dignity and happiness of woman to preside. This is her sphere, not inferior to that of man, but different from it. Here she has not only a right to vote, but to rule. If as is to be supposed, she is fitted for her place, nothing will be added to the dignity of the husband or to the happiness of the family by any interference with her where the responsibility properly falls upon her. The sphere of society, on the other hand, belongs to man, at least it has been hitherto regarded as belonging to him. For the support of its institutions and for those duties more immediately required for its welfare he is responsible. Here man has the right to vote, and nothing will be added to the dignity of the wife or to the happiness of society by any interference of the wife where the responsibility properly falls upon the husband. By a natural relation, and so by the appointment of God, the wife is the center of the domestic circle, the chief source of its happiness, and guardian of her husband's interests and rights in all that pertains to it. By a natural relation the husband is the house-band, the provider for its wants, its defender, and the guardian of the rights of the wife as of the children in their relations to society. He is the natural representative of both. The wife is not a child, but according to the Christian conception is nearer than that, is one with her husband, and their interests are one. If we suppose society composed of families alone, and if the rights of wives and children would not be secured by giving to every husband and father a share in the government, the fault would not be in the system, but in individual corruption that would work itself out whatever system might be adopted. Women have had wrongs, and so have children. These must be redressed, but this will not be done by disregarding any relation established by God. If parents and children, and husbands and wives, will act in the spirit of those relations, society will be perfected. If they will not do that, no political relations will avail. The same spirit on the part of men that would concede the right of voting, would concede and secure in a representative capacity every right without that.

For each of the spheres above spoken of men and women are fitted respectively by their physical organization and by their mental instincts and tendencies, and their relations to the children require that the spheres should be kept separate. It is not that man is not competent to set the table and rock the cradle, or that woman is not competent to vote. It is because the one life of society will not work itself out in more perfect results if these two great but interdependent spheres be left to those who naturally have charge of them."

These somewhat cogent, if old-fashioned reasons, for withholding suffrage from women are not noticed by its modern advocates.

It is assumed that the individual is the unit of society, responsibility for personal service under arms is ignored, and it is insisted that the sexes do constitute separate classes with distinct and antagonistic interests.

The author of the "Post" article begins by asserting that man has always unconsciously believed in female suffrage because art has embodied certain virtues in female forms. Art has also represented war in the form of the Goddess Bellona. Does that prove that man has always unconsciously believed that women should bear arms and fight? Not only has art represented these virtues by female figure, but also the muses, the graces, the fates and the furies. The female form lends itself best by its superior grace and beauty to the expression of ideals, therefore women ought to vote. What follows from the fact that from the beginning witches have always been represented as women? That ought to have some bearing on the question.

The author goes on to say that woman must not be content to sit outside public buildings as decorations, but must be vitalizing forces within them. That, of course, means, and it is what suffrage means, that women are to sit as judges and juries in the courts, as members in legislative halls, and are to be chosen governors and presidents. This is brought out more clearly later, when she says the law "denies us judgment by our peers; man can never justly judge a woman. he cannot justly make her laws or enforce the regulations of her conduct." This means nothing less than a dual system of government. "Judgment by our peers" requires, of course, female judges and juries. If man cannot "justly make woman's laws" he should have no voice in them and there must be female legislatures, and if "he cannot enforce the regulation of her conduct" there must be female sheriffs and policemen to do it, and militia as well

Continued on page 6

The Woman's Protest

Published Monthly by
The National Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage
35 West 39th Street, New York City
President, Mrs. Arthur M. Dodge.....New York
Secretary, Mrs. Eli Whitney.....New Haven, Conn.
Treasurer, Mrs. Robert Garrett..Roland Park, Baltimore

Vol. II. APRIL, 1913 No. 6.

The Woman's Protest invites letters from its readers.

WASHINGTON

It is with great reluctance that we depart from our usual custom of being entirely impersonal in the editorials of this magazine, but recent events concerning the suffrage parade in Washington make it necessary for our own defense and that of others to give some facts so that our readers may not receive an erroneous impression. Among the letters printed by one of the Washington papers on the subject of the police protection during the parade was one written by a college woman and signed with initials from which are the following extracts:

> "But back of this disgrace to the fair fame of our city lies the responsibility of a New York woman and a band of anti-suffragists. These women openly declared that any woman who offered for sale in our streets the literature of the suffragists would receive and deserve to receive insults from the men of Washington.
>
> "Moreover, for more than a week preceding the parade, cartoons were exhibited in the windows of the anti-suffrage headquarters. These cartoons depicted women in grotesque dress and attitudes, many of them so grossly suggestive that it is difficult to believe in the delicacy and pure-mindedness of the women so boldly flaunting these offensive pictures in their windows on a public street. Surely many of the great mob of hoodlums who heaped insults and ribald jests upon the earnest women marchers must have received their inspiration from the disgustingly suggestive cartoons viewed by thousands."

This letter we should not have noticed in any way if Dr. Anna Shaw, in an address at the House of Representatives, Harrisburg, Pa., on March 17th, had not made the statement:

> "Cartoons and literature, vulgar and indecent, prepared by the anti-suffragists and circulated by them through the medium of drunken brutes at Washington, was the direct cause of the riot there during the suffrage parade on the memorable March 3d."

The literature issued at the Anti Headquarters was the same as that printed and circulated by the office of the National Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage, and the charge that it is either vulgar or indecent is untrue. The cartoons referred to in both these statements were some of those printed in *Life* during the past few years. The charge that they are either vulgar or indecent is a distinct attack on the editors of that weekly, who have incurred the enmity of the suffragists because they definitely oppose woman suffrage. The imputation that the cartoons were vulgar (which were only exhibited in the windows of the temporary office which the National Association had in Washington and were not circulated) is also a direct attack on the President of that Association who it was well known had charge of that office.

To the unprejudiced observer, these cartoons were good-natured travesties of the suffrage claims, or serious expositions of the results of the suffrage movement. One or two referred especially to the militant suffragists in England, who were just at that time going to greater excesses than ever before.

Previous to the exhibition they had been carefully censored by a group of men and women whose good taste and judgment could be criticized by no one.

When compared to the cartoons which constantly appear in the *Woman's Journal*, the suffrage weekly, they were indeed tame and innocuous.

Believing that the only effective way of refuting these charges is to allow the public to judge for themselves the cartoons which were exhibited will be reproduced and be for sale on application at the National Association office in New York during two weeks beginning April 20th.

The women who oppose the suffrage stand, and always have stood, for the best interests of women. We hold unflinchingly a standard of nobility, purity and dignity and we deplore any action which tends to impair that ideal or lower it. Strength and forcefulness, intelligence and honesty, fair-mindedness and truth—these are some of the attributes of the woman we believe in. Education and opportunity wait upon her, and work, philanthropic, civic and domestic, calls upon her for aid. The aim and end of this Association is to help and not hinder woman's highest development, and we, therefore, cannot let pass the misstatements and attacks of those who would discredit us and who seek to lay upon our shoulders the responsibility of deplorable occurrences inspired by conditions which the complainants themselves aided in creating. No statement has yet been made by those of us who were in Washington preceding and during the 3rd of March, as to the real causes which affected the temper of the crowd—a temper which led to some, at least, of the alleged indignities and insults, and which the whole country must regret, not alone because they reflect upon the ordinary courtesy and decency due from men to women but also because so many women needlessly put themselves in a position where they invited the comments and criticisms of a street crowd which regarded them as a public, advertised show, and which in part at least was known to resent their presence at that particular time and in that particular way. The following are a few of our observations:

The residents of Washington of all classes resented deeply the insistence of the suffragists that their parade should take place the day before the Inauguration. It was announced constantly through the medium of the press that this parade would surpass in attraction and interest the Inaugural Parade. For weeks beforehand the clever publicity agents of the suffragists filled the papers with announcements of the so-called pageant. Requests were made, either with or without the sanction of the suffrage headquarters, for pretty girls to march. It was announced that women in classic draperies with bare feet would

dance on the steps of the Treasury Building. This dance was omitted from the final program but the announcement of it excited the indignation of thousands. Young girls of 14 years distributed literature on the streets and accosted men with requests to wear their colors. Every possible means of advertising the suffrage cause through the exploitation of young women was used to attract the attention of the public. Women spoke on the street corners and from soap boxes, haranguing the crowd which gathered, and while we have become accustomed to this sort of thing in other cities it was new in Washington and created a bad impression, especially on the Man in the Street. Washington is sufficiently far south for the existence of a feeling that the public streets are not a proper place for women and young girls to make themselves conspicuous. The daily reports of the Hikers, interesting but mainly facetious, aided in deepening this impression and their entrance into Washington preceded by women in rather theatrical make-up, and surrounded by men and boys did not serve to lessen it.

In fact, the trouble experienced on the day of the parade was foreshadowed by the greeting given the Hikers by the Washington crowds. The so-called "cheers" sounded considerably more like jeers.

And the idea of the entire affair which had apparently been formed by Washington and visiting crowds was heightened when the girls on one float and at least one rider started their parade up Pennsylvania avenue with throwing kisses to the crowd.

The crowd which witnessed the parade was made up partly of residents of Washington whose attitude towards it had been influenced by the events of preceding days, and an enormous number from neighboring cities who came prepared, through the wide-spread advertising, to see a free show. Thousands of them from the South were men who are not accustomed to see what the suffragists have called their paraders, "representatives of pure American womanhood," walking in the middle of the street. It has often been stated by women who have marched in the parades in New York that at least the crowds on the sidewalk treated them respectfully and that there was no adverse criticism. During these parades police protection kept the crowds off the street, but adverse criticism and remarks made along the line were constant and often so extreme as to be unprintable. If the crowds in Washington had been kept to the sidewalks the criticism would probably have been limited to verbal expression and not been shown by personal violence, as has been alleged.

The cause of the insufficient police protection is a matter which is still under discussion before Congress at the present writing. Until that investigation is completed we prefer to reserve judgment, but a few facts have already been made clear. The Chief of Police had warned the suffragists that it would be difficult to give them adequate protection the day before the Inauguration owing to the enormous crowds in the city, and begged them to have their parade on some other day. According to the permit given by Congress, the streets could not be cleared until two o'clock, at which time they were already filled. During the Inaugural Parade thousands occupied stands, windows, etc. During the suffrage parade, almost the entire crowd was in the streets. President Wilson arrived at half-past two, and as it was necessary to accord him police protection some of the force, already inadequate in number, was diverted for that purpose.

The Chief of Police has stated that the number of the force on duty at the Suffrage Parade was much larger than during the Inaugural Parade the next day. The only error in judgment seems to have been his unwillingness to call out the troops that were waiting at Fort Myer. The imputation of many suffragists that Major Sylvester did not object to the subjection of the paraders to insults seems unwarrantable. The behavior of individual members of the police force is another matter.

Many of the paraders themselves have stated that they saw no violence and heard no insults; that "the crowd was good-natured, out for a good time, and the inevitable happened."

Apparently, however, the suffragists are not entirely displeased over the turn events took on that day.

Alice Paul declared that they "were delighted at the publicity given their cause through the investigation of the Washington police department by a Senate sub-committee." Indeed Miss Paul says, "We feel well repaid for the trouble by the publicity obtained."

The temporary office which the National Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage took in Washington last month was successful—much more so than we had anticipated—because of the indignant attitude of the large number of citizens of Washington, both men and women, over the influx of suffragists at this time.

The dignity and self-control always adhered to was sometimes strained by the efforts of indignant suffragists to enter into debate. But discussion was discouraged and nothing unpleasant occurred.

Enormous amounts of literature were sold, over 2,000 signatures obtained, and 5,000 buttons and badges were sold in the four days preceding the suffrage parade and were especially conspicuous on that day.

Many calls were received for speakers for meetings, especially from schools and colleges, and we could have kept a dozen speakers busy during the two weeks. We were able to supply them, however, for only three meetings besides the one held at the big Belasco theater. There was an enormous attendance at this meeting and hundreds were turned away at the doors. It was a splendidly representative audience. The speakers were Mrs. John Martin and Miss Minnie Bronson, of New York, and Miss Lucy Price, of Cleveland. Mrs. Arthur M. Dodge, introducing the speakers, said:

"We are assembled here to-day under the United States flag, a flag which bears in its field of blue forty-eight stars, although our Suffragist friends have often displayed, and paraded under, a mutilated flag which recognizes only what they term 'the true States,' that is, the States which grant suffrage to women. Under that flag we claim the right of protest, which is as well established as the right of petition. In protesting against the imposition of political duties upon women, we know we voice the majority of the women of the United States.

"It is with great reluctance that our Association appears at this time and in this place. The Woman Suffrage Party is making use of an event of great significance in the life of our nation to advertise its tenets. The inauguration of a President of the United States of America has for one hundred and twenty-five years been conducted without an attempt to use that event for the furtherance of political propaganda. It has remained for women, who promise us by their votes to show a more excellent way in government, to convert a time of dignified seriousness into spectacular parades. As a protest to this method of procedure, the National Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage comes to you to-day asking your attention for some of the arguments against the enfranchisement of woman. We have no appeal to make to the emotions. We have no war cry. We can not supply the glamour of a propaganda, but we have behind us the sane conviction of the sober-minded women of this country, who are striving to bear their responsibilities and carry their part of the burden of society, and do not see in the ballot the most effective means of performing these responsibilities.

"We do not use the methods of our English sisters, which are upheld by many Suffragists here—the method of concussion and percussion—but we do ask for a discussion, since there is honest difference of opinion."

"Some Ideals of the Suffrage" Shattered by Searching Analysis

Continued from page 3

just as there are for men when they get beyond the control of the ordinary instruments of the law. Who ever heard before that justice was a matter of sex? There is no half-way stopping-place in such a movement and the inevitable result of universal female suffrage will be the formation of male and female parties, the men naturally wishing to hold on to the power and control they have always exercised, and the women insisting with the votes to back them that they are entitled to at least half the offices. That they would seek them with avidity cannot be questioned. Think of the campaigns we should have. That conducted by the Suffragettes in England who are made up entirely, we are told, of women of education tells us what to expect when all the kitchens and all the slums and shady districts of the great cities add their recruits to the army. Suffragette methods also teach us what to expect were women sitting in Parliament and in Congress. The question is one to be decided by calm discussion and reason. Away with reason, they say. "We will rush Parliament." Other causes must wait till the powers that be are convinced. We brook no delay. And so it would be were they legislators. The few willing to reason, some would say capable of reasoning, would be swamped, and sentiment, impulse, woman's intuitive knowledge of what is best, and hysteria would override anything. It is not alone from the behavior of the suffragettes that we are entitled to infer this. Look at what goes on in a D. A. R. convention with nothing but the honorary office involved. Fierce strife, relieved by weeping and embraces. Take another organization, the W. C. T. U., and judge from their long-continued attitude in regard to the army canteen whether they are fit to legislate. It is the deliberate and almost unanimous opinion of every army officer, and they may be supposed to know something about their men, and to have their welfare at heart, that the pernicious and meddlesome interference of these women resulting in the abolition of the canteen has done more to injure the army and lower its moral tone than anything in its history. This has been repeatedly pointed out and established by overwhelming evidence convincing to every one who uses reason or judgment in reaching a conclusion. These women have been ruled by wilfully blind sentiment, worked up to a frenzy, and this single experience shows that if women came to control in elections and legislatures, the country must expect to find itself run on that basis. They, too, are responsible for the unwise and harmful prohibition legislation which has been so general recently and from which there are already signs of violent reaction certain to leave the situation worse than before. The same thing applies to juries, for if a man's business cannot excuse him from sitting on a jury no more can a woman's domestic duties, and she demands female juries. The children must be locked up or turned over to the servants or the neighbors, while twelve women analyze and discuss and pass upon the unsavory details of all sorts of crime that fill the courts. Women proverbially have less reverence for law than men, they are the chief smugglers, and they would be guided in reaching verdicts by the extent to which their passions would be aroused or their prejudices and sympathies enlisted.

This author continues, "The sisterhood of woman should be as close a bond as the brotherhood of man, and nothing will bind us more effectively in that sisterhood than the ballot." That is an amazing theory. The brotherhood of man has always been used to express the solidarity of the entire race without reference to sex and the fact that a tie exists throughout, involving universal affection and consideration from each to all, and by all to each. The race is snipped in two with the scissors of sex and makes man a brotherhood and woman a sisterhood set apart from and one against each other, each with its first duty to itself, and she finds that nothing will bind women in a sisterhood like the ballot. Natural ties, congenial tasks, friendship, association in work and play, common interests, nothing will hold women in close sisterly relation like possessing the ballot. There is no evidence of its having produced any such effect so far, and no possible reason in the nature of things why it should. On the contrary, as among men the ballot has caused the bitterest strife, and there is not the slightest reason to believe that it would be a bond of sisterhood among women.

Again to quote, "Woman is gaily clad, glittering and futile" that "her voice tinkles like the music, but must stop when serious talk begins." If this be so, it is woman's own fault, but it is not so. At the Capitol men talk with women on every serious subject unless it be active practical politics, and ask their opinion on every subject that comes up for discussion. It is safe to say that her influence is greater now than if she were ranged in an opposite camp. The case cited in regard to army canteen legislation is evidence of that. A quiet canvass showed that a large majority of Congress believed in maintaining the canteen, but when it came to the vote woman's influence killed it, and dealt the army a staggering blow at the same time. The author cites the work of Elizabeth Fry as a reason why woman should vote. There have been many others like her. Florence Nightingale, Frances Power Cobbe, Dorothea Dix, Clara Barton, to name a few, have accomplished great things without the suffrage, doubtless more than though they had had it, and the men in public life partly of their own initiative and partly stirred up and advised by good and clean women are carrying forward remedial social legislation as fast as the knowledge we have makes it safe and expedient to go. Woman is just as influential now in regard to schools, parks, condition of children and every other good cause as she ever can be under any circumstances. Whatever she asks intelligently and convincingly she always gets and often, as in the canteen case, a great deal more. The author reproaches the Government because, having already become highly paternalistic, it did not instantly on demand when a bill was introduced establishing a bureau for children turn wet nurse. She demands also specifically in addition to the general demand for female juries that the erring of her own sex be brought before juries of women. If they find no more mercy there than around the tea table, may the Lord have mercy on them, for in that tribunal compassionate consideration for the fallen is rarely heard. She, also, with a logic that seems to be peculiarly feminine, reproaches the women opposed to suffrage and who are active in repelling what they regard the assault being made on their homes, and whom she and those like her have compelled thus to occupy themselves with spending more time thus than they would in casting the ballot. It is merely a question of which takes up the most time. Powerful reasoning truly. Of course, the Anti-Suffragists should never have ventured to have an opinion or to assent, or attempt to maintain it. They are plainly told they are all pitiable slaves. "In the social life she is an ornament, in the economic life a slave." Poor things.

A principal stock argument of the Suffragists has been that they would produce, when they gained their rights, improved conditions everywhere. Experience in the States where suffrage obtains shows, if not the contrary, that there has been no beneficial results. Politics have not been purified nor has there been any diminution of bossism, or of any of the prevailing political or social evils. As already stated, if we are to abandon the family unit theory, the representative theory, and the theory that the suffrage is a privilege granted by society, and not a universal right, and base the social and political order wholly on individualism, every individual, without exception, must not only be conceded the right, but must be held rigidly to the

Concluded on page 7

Pertinent Questions

By Marie J. Andrews

I am a woman; I love my sex. If woman is strong, I glory in her strength; if she is weak, I would shield her. But when she forgets that she is woman, I would remind her of her sex.

I respect a man only so long as he is manly; God made him man. I respect a woman only so long as she is womanly; God made her woman. In the handling of affairs, a feminine man or a mannish woman is forever out of place. This "I" is not a personal *ego,* as I am unknown. It is the voice of the silent multitude of women who are pleading to be allowed to remain just women.

The crowd of adventurers known as Suffragettes have, by their vituperative speeches, "yallow" tracts, ridiculous parades, and finally, criminal proceedings, unpleasantly forced themselves upon the public. They have invaded our peace; call us cowards and copperheads; bully us to "come out and fight."

I wish to ask a few questions. These are not idle things of my imagination; but form the experiences of years of wide-awake observations.

I do not ask them of the Suffragettes, who would descend to be the "equal" with men, but of my sisters who would have the men ascend and be "equal" with them. This last we women of America had begun to do. We are still the majority.

The Suffragettes say: "We will clean up politics when we get the vote." That word "clean" has a wholesome sound. But have they made a clean beginning? I wonder what their homes look like! Do not smile; I know the word "home" is dragged after them in the mud. But—are we good housekeepers? Are our windows and our curtains clean? If our parlors are clean, are our kitchens, our cellars, our back yards? Do we know what is in the dark places in our closets? Do we know how to buy the proper food and to cook it properly?

If our servants are incompetent, can we instruct them? Are we willing to have "just anything" do our work, that we may go about, play bridge and what-not-else? Do we require our servants to be clean and refuse them bathrooms? Are their rooms "like home," or are they miserable coops somewhere at the top of the house, cold in winter and hot in summer? Do we treat them as "just servants," or do we show them that we know they have souls answerable to God the same as our own? By our own example, do we teach them that work is honorable?

Have we husbands, and do they still love us? Do we still honor them as the head of the family? Have we little children? Do we know their thoughts, their playmates, their every joy and sorrow? Do they think us the dearest beings on earth? If not, we have somehow failed and are not fit to go into politics. The son will do his duty in the political household if his mother shall have done hers in her home. Are we servants? Do we realize that a clean obedience is the right thing to render our mistresses, and that our virtues will win their respect.

Are we teachers? Do we teach, or only hold the book? Do we teach honesty, love of country, cleanliness and the other virtues, together with the "three R's"? What the "teacher says" is remembered while life lasts.

Are we clerks in shops? Do we stand chattering with one another and indifferently wait upon our customers? Do we want to be called "ladies" before we learn to be polite? If so, we are unfaithful to the house of our employers—we have failed in our duty, and are not yet fit to vote. Are our homes so ordered that if we should suddenly die to-day we would not be ashamed to be brought home by strangers?

If our home duties are well done, and we still have time to do other things, there are many avenues open to us for work. Noble women are already in the field calling, not for the vote, but for *us* to come and help.

Are we sure that we know what this *vote* means?

Shall we enlist as soldiers? Do we long to be firemen? Are we anxious to walk the lonely "beat" of a night policeman? Are we counting the days until we may sit on a jury? These are a few things that shall be our "rights" in that sweet-by-and-by.

Are we beautiful women? Do we thank the man who gives us his seat in the crowded car? Do we smoke and drink cocktails with our men friends? Perhaps we have the "right" to do so, but it is a familiarity that breeds contempt. Women, as well as men, admire a beautiful woman. You have the power to keep that admiration, if you do not forget your self-respect.

Are we fashionable women? Do we honestly think we have sense enough to vote, so long as we wear false hair, brain-crushing hats, devilish hatpins, cruel corsets and back-breaking heels on our *walking* shoes. I wonder where the doctors are that they do not protest against the fashions. Imagine the *Milo* alive and dressed in the modern long corset! O ye Greek Gods!

When we have freed ourselves from the shackles of fashion; when we have learned to keep our own house clean; brought up our sons and daughters in the fear of God, taught them to wave no flag but the Stars and Stripes; helped our immigrant sisters to know what Americanism means; when we no longer fear to lift up our unfortunate sisters and help them to walk alone; then, and only then, can we begin to ask if it is necessary to meddle in politics, which is indisputably man's work. When that time comes, I think politics will be "cleaned up," and cleansed by the women, too. Our clean sons will be doing their duty because we have done ours. Is there to-day a wrong that any woman has done to her that cannot be righted by making the proper appeal? A distinguished Italian said to me many years ago:

"The American woman is the *poetry* of her nation."

Man's work is prose. He needs the poetry of home. Give this to him, and he will protect it. Let us "Fling away ambition; for by that sin fell the angels." Let us "fling away" vanity; our "right" to be common; and our nagging.

Let us be women; and walk gently beside the men.

That is right; and our "right."

"SOME IDEALS OF THE SUFFRAGE" SHATTERED

Continued from page 6

reciprocal duty. Women must not only hold all the offices they can get, and serve in legislatures and on juries, but they must be politicians, policemen and bear arms, and that they may as well do, for they will surely cease to bear children.

The article in the "Post" closes by telling us that the Suffragist "was foreshadowed some three thousand years ago, when it was said 'she opens her mouth with wisdom and stretches out her hand to the needy and in her mouth is the law of kindness.'" That appears to be an unfortunate citation for her purpose. The wise, gentle, kindly woman described is not foreshadowed or predicted at some future time when she should have the ballot. She belonged to the time when the description was written—before suffrage was even dreamed of.

It is said of her then:

"Her husband is known in the gates when he sitteth among the elders of the land (she does not sit with him). Strength and honor are her clothing; she shall rejoice in the time to come. She openeth her mouth with wisdom; and in her tongue is the law of kindness. She looketh well to the ways of her household, and eateth not the bread of idleness. Her children arise up and call her blessed; her husband also, and he praiseth her."

Women like her have existed without the suffrage all down through the ages, and still exist in increasing numbers. Nothing less than the suffrage can detract from her charm or lessen her influence. Who would exchange her for a Suffragette?

Female suffrage, like socialism, which has turned the heads of some educated people, and like it has become an unreasoning cult, is but a passing craze. People will look back as the silverites and the greenbackers do now and wonder how they ever could have held such views.

Higher Education of Women Independent of Suffrage

The Suffragists say that the opposition now shown to Suffrage for Women is on a par with, and no more worthy of consideration than the opposition once made to the opening of colleges and higher education to women. Granting for the sake of argument that the higher education, and especially co-education, has triumphantly overridden all the objections once made to it and fully justified itself (which is granting a great deal), we still contend that Suffrage and Education are two totally different questions. While all Suffragists presumably believe in higher education as they believe in economic independence for women, all highly educated and economically independent women do not believe in Woman Suffrage. And the reasons are manifold.

Higher education is a personal and private matter. It bestows no right to govern, to make laws, to change the Constitution; nor does it alter the political and legal status of women as a whole. Higher education is an opportunity offered to a few, not a burden thrust upon the many. It does not and never can affect all women, and the worst that can be said of it is just what was said of it by those who in the beginning opposed it. That it would or might lead to making a restless, mateless, dissatisfied class of women.

The advantage of higher education for woman is a question of opinion largely. While I do not go so far as my friend's Italian cook who refuses to learn to read or write because she thinks it would distract her from her service, I am unable to see that higher education can be an advantage when restlessness and unfitness are the result. It seems to me that the highest education leads back to service and to adjustment, and that the present day danger is that we shall be swamped by the notion of intellectuality as opposed to intelligence, that the "half-baked" shall lead the ignorant into troubles and dangers which they are blind to.

Higher education certainly implies a certain intellectual accomplishment, but, alas! it implies nothing as regards common sense and good judgment. Still no one would wish to see the opportunity to higher education denied to women bacause it is a personal and private matter, like any other vocation, and interferes with no other individual's right.

Voting is a different thing entirely, and there is such a principle as "consent of the governed" involved in it. Moreover, Anti-Suffragists do not see why they should be dragged to the polls merely to cancel the Suffrage vote when the same result can be obtained by Suffragists keeping away. A break in the ranks of women is certain. There is not the slightest evidence of any great or desirable change to come from voting that is not accomplished easily without it.

England, in the last few months, without votes for women, has reformed the Divorce Law, passed the White Slave Bill and established Pure Milk Depots. Several women served on the Divorce Commission. The opinions of specially equipped women are very seriously considered in England and that wholly desirable condition is coming to pass with us. Miss Jane Addams, Miss Ida Tarbell, Miss Kate Barnard and Miss Julia Lathrop (all unattached) and many other women of brains and character are beginning to exert a large and beneficent influence in public affairs, and the more intelligence and public spirit is developed among women, the greater their influence for good is bound to become. When the Anti-Suffrage position is more clearly understood we hope and believe it will be generally accepted.

We are not opposed to woman's influence—on the contrary we most sincerely believe in it. We are definitely and irrevocably opposed to votes for women because we know that under Socialism woman's influence is nil. We know that Miss Jane Addams and Miss Kate Barnard's influence can be to a considerable extent cancelled by the votes of ignorant and corrupt women, and we think that our point is entirely missed or ignored when it is answered flippantly that Miss Addams or Miss Barnard are as well received by legislators as formerly. Of course they are. That, however, is quite beside the question. Their reception or the personal courtesy they receive would not console them, however, if they were hampered in their efforts to do good by the ignorant woman's vote.

J. T. W.

WOMAN'S MISSION

(Lines found in the Bible of a dear, old-fashioned grandmother.)

The rights of women—what are they?
The right to labor, love and pray;
The right to weep with those that weep,
The right to wake when others sleep.

The right to dry the falling tear,
The right to quell the rising fear;
The right to smooth the brow of care
And whisper comfort in despair.

The right to watch the parting breath,
To soothe and cheer the bed of death;
The right when earthly hopes all fail,
To point to that within the veil.

The right the wanderer to reclaim,
And win the lost from paths of shame;
The right to comfort and to bless
The widow and the fatherless.

The right the little ones to guide,
In simple faith, to him who died;
With earnest love and gentle praise,
To bless and cheer their youthful days.

The right the intellect to train,
And guide the mind to noble aim;
Teach it to rise above earth's toys,
And fix the heart on heavenly joys.

The right to live for him you love,
The right to die that love to prove;
The right to brighten earthly homes
With pleasant smiles and gentle tones.

Are these thy rights? Then use them well,
The holy influence none can tell;
If these be thine, why ask for more?
Thou hast enough to answer for!

Are these thy rights? Then murmur not,
That woman's mission is they lot;
Improve the talents God hath given;
Earth's duties done, they rest in heaven!

GERTRUDE A. W. SEIBERT.

The Woman's Rebellion as Seen by a Man

Among all the wars, political upheavals, changes of governmental forms, labor disturbances and manifestations of social unrest of every sort now in evidence, there is none so novel or so wholly without grounds or justification as the woman's rebellion in Great Britain. In the first place, what they are contending for is not a right, for it has always, under all forms of government, been held that the franchise was a privilege which society was entitled to bestow in any way which to it seemed best. That privilege has been withheld for various reasons from different classes of citizens, and society has the right and the power to either extend or curtail it, at any time it sees fit, and for any reason it judges to be sufficient, having in view supposedly the interests of all concerned. Seeking a privilege which they have not demonstrated it would be wise or useful for them to possess, and the bestowal of which is opposed by a majority of their own sex, they have worked themselves up to a degree of hysterical excitement which has made and is making criminals of a very selfish and contemptible sort of large numbers of them. Posing as champions of right and justice, they wilfully violate both, by destroying the property of innocent third persons, ruining mail matter, and even going the length of setting fire to theaters and dynamiting houses.

The Government seems to have dealt with them very weakly and ineffectively. There is undoubtedly more or less mental disorder involved, which can only be checked by stern repression. Women force the frank discussion of this topic. It is well known that at intervals they are subject to derangement when of the best of them it is said, "pay no attention to what she says or does at present, she is not quite responsible." It is part of the burden which the continuance of the race imposes, and it is preceded, accompanied and followed by conditions peculiarly susceptible to hysteria. When these women become deliberate and obstinate law breakers they should be treated just like other law breakers. Male prisoners are not allowed to starve themselves, nor should they be, and the obstinate and contumacious ones should have the hose turned on them, or, as an English paper has suggested, given a public spanking. Hysterical criminality bordering on insanity has to be dealt with differently from the ordinary sort, and it is inconceivable that a great government will allow itself to be coerced into the adoption of a measure of the profoundest importance destroying the entire philosophic theory on which society has been constructed, and carried on, by a minority of the women of the country who choose to make viragos and ruffians of themselves, and to injure property and assault officials, with the expectation that because they are women the rigors of the law will not be invoked against them. It has been a mistake from the outset to treat them any differently from other criminals. They have made it painfully apparent by their behavior what sort of conditions will prevail when they enter public life, as the suffragists all aim to do. Legislatures will become pandemoniums of female shrieks, flying missiles and slashing and smashing of furniture, which we should be told it would be impolite to ladies to interfere with, and which they insist are perfectly proper and permissible methods of carrying points which they have decided upon. Woman's intuition, even in matters of government we are told, is far more correct and to be relied on than the judgment of a mere man, one of whom has sacreligiously characterized such intuition as "an indefinable something which wings its unerring flight from no premises to speak of to a foregone conclusion."

I have spoken of what gradually became the fundamental basis of society through long evolution, growing out of differentiation of function due to sex, the wisdom and beneficence of which has only recently been called in question.

It is well to revert to that theory, for in the discussion and clamor of the time it is lost sight of. It supposed the race to be one, and not divided into two classes; that the family was the social unit and not the individual. That man was not higher than woman, nor woman than man, but they were differently endowed by Nature in order that both working together harmoniously, recognizing each other's limitations, might attain the best results for themselves, for their families, for society and for the race. Upon woman was laid the heavy burden of child bearing, carrying with it logically child rearing, and all the cares and affairs of domestic life. Upon man fell the work of the provider and defender of the family, and of society, and the two together made up the best attainable whole. No one has yet demonstrated, nor are the men and women who act from calm reason and judgment and are not swept away by passing crazes, convinced that anything but harm can result from attempting to destroy the basis which Nature and the wisdom of the ages has established. Every desirable reform can be compassed without it. The desire for it is a part of the wild radicalism which is trying to destroy representative government, from which, in States like Missouri and Kansas, there are strong signs of reaction. Ohio did well to call a halt on female suffrage. At least wait and see how it works in the States that have it, when the novelty and glamour have gone. The number in those States who condemn it as a failure is growing.

Meanwhile let sensible women ask themselves a few questions. Would they not be of more benefit to mankind, contribute more to the advancement of the race, and be infinitely happier themselves, were they to wish first to fulfil what their whole anatomical purport calls for, being the mothers of healthy, intelligent, moral children. Are they meeting so perfectly the duties now incumbent on them, and occupying so fully and effectively the fields now open to them, that they must needs insist upon burdening themselves with duties and responsibilities at the best foreign to their natures, and in which, under any circumstances, they must always play an inferior part? With the desire for the limelight which we have always deprecated in our mothers and sisters, but which they are developing to the utmost, and with the office seeking and place hunting which they have already exhibited, they are on the way to bring about a sex antagonism which has never before existed, and which must be harmful.

A MERE MAN.

AMENDMENT TO LADY SOMERSET'S FAMOUS REPLY

Recently reading a suffragist's tract,
Smilingly wond'ring how much was a fact,
Carelessly glancing from one page to next,
I saw an answer to question much vexed.

Antis had pestered and bothered them so,
Constantly aiming at cause a hard blow;
Ever declaring that it was not right
Women should vote when unable to fight.

The Lady Somerset quelled their alarms;
"They who bear soldiers don't need to bear arms."
Finally settling forever the point,
Answer that could not be put out of joint.

Surely, conclusively, last word was said—
Stealthily creeping, thought entered my head,
Sensible people will please kindly note,
They who bear voters have no need to vote.

ANNA M. FIELDING.

Pennsylvania's Active Opposition

The Pennsylvania Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage was first organized in November, 1909, when a Constitution modeled on that of the New York State Association was adopted. Since then, regular monthly meetings have been held, and many special ones, also several large meetings, to which the public were invited.

The membership of the Association has greatly increased, and its influence has been widely extended and strengthened. Several branch Associations in and near Philadelphia have been organized. "The Pittsburgh Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage," allied with ours, has displayed great energy and activity, and has a large membership.

The Pennsylvania Association has its headquarters at 261 South Fifteenth Street, Philadelphia. The General Secretary is there daily from 10 A. M. until 6 P. M. to register new members, distribute literature and attend to other business. A large public meeting was held at the Garrick Theater on January 25, 1913. Addresses were made by Miss Alice Hill Chittenden, Mrs. Frank Goodwin and Dr. Robert Ellis Thompson.

The "Commission to Revise and Codify the Election Laws of Pennsylvania" invited our Association to present its views on woman suffrage at a public hearing granted at the City Hall on March 22, 1912. A large delegation from our Association attended this hearing, and very able and convincing addresses were made by Miss Minnie Bronson and Miss Emily P. Bissell.

Letters were sent from our Association in May to every candidate nominated for the State Legislature, in number about eight hundred. The candidates were requested not to pledge themselves for or against woman suffrage until the report of the Commission to Revise Election Laws should be made public. This Commission has recently published its report, and by a majority of six to one declares itself against recommending an amendment to the Constitution which would exend suffrage to women.

The report states, among other things: "The question is not one to be decided merely upon the basis of women's mental or physical equality with man or upon the injustice of refusing her a vote to protect her property rights. The real question is the benefit or disadvantage to the Commonwealth by making such a change in its organic law. It is apparent that if the effect of amending the Constitution so as to give votes to women would be to add to the electorate a large mass of indifferent citizens who do not desire the franchise and are unwilling to assume the responsibility of exercising it, the result would be a detriment to the State, even though a few active and intelligent women would avail themselves of the privilege. The indifferent citizen who is careless of his political privileges is almost as much a menace to the State as the corrupt one. * * * The Commission, therefore, makes no recommendation on the subject of woman suffrage."

A forum for discussing woman suffrage was opened in the "Public Ledger" in May. On the invitation of the editor, letters giving the arguments against woman suffrage were contributed regularly by several of our members, and on every Sunday from May 1st until December 8th the Forum of the "Ledger" was supplied with reasons which seem to us unanswerable and which should have been convincing.

Our Association has published a Digest of the Laws of Pennsylvania relating to women and children, prepared by a number of able lawyers, and a comparison of these laws made with those of Colorado, greatly to the disadvantage of the latter. A copy of the "Remonstrance" for January, 1913, was sent from the office in Boston to every member of our State Legislature, with the compliments of the "Pennsylvania Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage." Our Association has reprinted the speech of Hon. Stanley E. Bowdle, delivered before the Ohio Constitutional Convention, and a copy of this address has been sent to each member of our Legislature.

The hearing on the suffrage question by the Pennsylvania Senate Committee, held March 18th, at Harrisburg, attracted the largest crowd which has been in the Pennsylvania Capitol this year.

Every seat was taken on the floor and in the gallery and three hundred extra chairs were placed in the chamber to accommodate the crowds.

The contending armies assembled their forces from all parts of the State, especially from Philadelphia and Pittsburgh. Each side was granted an hour to present its case, and the suffragists were given a short time for rebuttal at the close.

Speakers for the Antis were Mrs, A. J. George, of Brookline, Mass., Mrs. Horace Brock of Philadelphia, President of the Pennsylvania Association, Mrs. Edward Beecher Finck, of Philadelphia; for the Suffragists, Mrs. Beatrice Forbes-Robertson Hale, Rev. Dr. Anna Howard Shaw, and Miss Mary Bakewell, of Pittsburgh.

The measure has already passed the lower house of the Pennsylvania legislature, and if the Senate should concur with this vote the amendment must again be passed by the session of 1915 and then go to the people.

A house-to-house canvass has been voluntarily undertaken in different parts of Philadelphia and vicinity to ascertain the views of women as regards the suffrage, and the result has given substantial support to the contention that only a very small minority of the women of Pennsylvania have any desire to vote.

VIOLET M. BIRDSALL,
Vice-President.

On January 17, 1913, the "Men's League Opposed to Woman Suffrage" was organized and a president and officers were elected. The Board of Directors was completed in February, 1913, and the League has now two hundred members and is constantly adding to its list the names of men prominent in business and professions, as well as of wage-earners. These new members are eager to join, and ardently in sympathy with the cause for which the women of the Pennsylvania Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage have appealed to them. They are pledged to use every legal means to defeat the amendment to the Constitution granting suffrage to women should it be submitted to the voters of this State.

The officers are: President, S. Davis Page; Vice-Presidents, Francis Howard Williams, W. W. Frazier; Secretary, Rev. Edward James McHenry, Haverford Avenue and 48th Street; Treasurer, John Wilson Brown, Jr., Vernon Road, east of Stenton Avenue; Board of Directors, John Wilson Brown, Jr., Charles W. Macfarlane, M.D., John Cadwalader, Jr., Francis Rawle, W. D. Winsor, Theodore M. Etting, Charles I. Wilkinson, Horace Howard Furness, Jr., Charles C. Binney, Edward James McHenry.

SHOULD A SUFFRAGETTE MARRY?

(Tune, "Needles and Pins.")

Hammer and tongs, hammer and tongs;
When a Suffragette marries
She'll right no more wrongs.

She'll sit by the fireside, where she belongs,
And instead of parading
She'll sing cradle-songs!

For the married career she secretly longs,
And if given a chance
Should drop hammer and tongs.

CAROLINE M. PARKER.

Situation in Other States

The question of woman suffrage is before the people of six States. The legislatures of Montana, Nevada, North Dakota, South Dakota, New York and Michigan have voted to allow the vote of the people to decide—in most instances with the idea, not of going on record as approving suffrage, but of shunting the responsibility to the people. In Ohio, too, the question might be considered to be before the people as at the last constitutional election, the referendum measure was adopted and by obtaining a sufficient number of signatures the suffragists may bring the matter up at any time, and are now considering whether to have the petitions attempted for 1913 or 1914.

In seven States, Delaware, Missouri, New Hampshire, Nebraska, Maine, Iowa and Minnesota, the measures were defeated by the legislatures, and in Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Arkansas, Texas and Connecticut the legislatures have the question under consideration at the present time.

On March 25th the Woman's Suffrage bill failed in the Massachusetts House of Represenatives. The vote was 144 to 88 in favor of the legislation, but lacked ten of the two-thirds vote required for the bill's adoption.

In New York the Antis joined in asking for the submission to the people.

Unless the women can get legislative consent for a special election this year, the question cannot be voted on in Nevada until 1914. In Montana and South Dakota only one legislature has to act and the women are ready to begin their campaign.

Indefinite postponement of the constitutional amendment resolution was made by the suffrage senate committee on the amendment in Iowa, after the house had passed the resolution.

All hope of the Missouri legislature submitting the question to the people was lost when the Senate Committee on Constitutional Amendments recommended a substitute giving the legislature the power to decide the issue. The substitute, if adopted by the people, November, 1914, would remove the right to adopt equal suffrage by the initiative and place it entirely in the hands of the legislature.

The legislature of Alaska gave the women equal suffrage.

A *New York American* despatch in regard to the Hartford legislative hearing follows:

HARTFORD, March 19. Miss Lucy Price, of Cleveland, quiet but confident, stood in the historic chamber of the Connecticut House of Representatives for two hours this afternoon and made a record of the best speech, the most telling array of arguments, and the most lucid marshalling of facts that has ever won over a State house audience.

It was "anti" day at the Capitol, and the Connecticut Association of Women opposed to suffrage held forth before the same committee which yesterday heard arguments in behalf of the cause, the huge chamber being crowded.

Should We Have a Social Revolution?

Woman suffrage is, if it is anything, the breath of a social revolution. To justify the demand for it, the Suffragists must prove two things: first, that the present condition of woman as regards everything which the ballot could influence is wrong; and second, that the special change they are asking for is the right change to have made.

The statute books of practically every State in the Union prove that woman is at present an especially privileged class; that she is treated more justly by the laws all over the country which discriminate between her and man in favor of her. This is true of laws for the property-owning woman as it is for the wage-earning woman. Security of property rights and of wages and industrial conditions demanded by the laws show her to have been given very special favors by the men legislators elected by men voters.

The end of the movement, the aim of this special revolution, is vague since the Suffragists differ upon it. Some of those franker or more discerning ones, like Dr. Anna Howard Shaw, say they promise nothing—they do not know what will be accomplished by their success, if it should come—that they ask it as a right only.

There is no such thing, of course, as a right to suffrage. If there were, this right would apply to one kind of suffrage, of voting, as well as to another. Every man in the country would have a right to come to Washington and vote upon every measure before Congress. The deciding upon certain officials called Congressmen and Senators is no more an artificial thing than the deciding upon what people are to be the electors of the country. Both were matters of expediency —that which seemed best for the nation and the communities.

As for the results promised by the more hopeful of the Suffragists, examination of the suffrage States proves these are mythical. They have done nothing for the working girl, for the cause of temperance, for the moral uplift of politics, nor toward the abolition of white slavery—the four things which they most emphasize. And in every non-suffrage State women are helping along these lines through the elevating of public opinion.

Since the condition of woman at present is a favored position, and since no beneficent results can be hoped for from this social revolution, we are not Suffragists. But because there is another side—a positive loss to woman and cost to the community—we are Anti-Suffragists.

This loss will come in many ways, all of tremendous importance. The loss by woman of non-partisanship, her greatest asset as a reformer; the loss of her influence as the balance-wheel of the race; the effect upon the growing generation as instanced in the steady increase of juvenile crime in Denver; the gradual but inevitable disruption of the unity of the family; the trend toward socialism; and the loss of her privileges held at present in the industrial and economic world are some of the greatest factors of the cost of such a revolution as the Suffragists are asking to have overturn present conditions because an exceptionally low per cent. of the women of the country are restless and dissatisfied.

An explosive phial was taken lately from a pillar box in London which contained $30,000 in paper money. Much of this was doubtless money sent by working men and women for the support of their families. Happily it was uninjured as the explosives were removed in time.

MME. FINAYRE ON ECONOMIC INDEPENDENCE

Marcelle Finayre is a Feminist and one of the cleverest writers in France. She does not share the views of American suffragists on economic independence for all women, for in France this has been thoroughly tried. Here is what she says to a young married woman who wished to join the "pin-money brigade": "There are on the pavements of Paris hundreds and hundreds of young women better trained than you and braver who would accept with joy any honorable situation with a minimum salary. They know foreign languages and stenography. They work, not for superfluities, but for necessities. How dare you dispute with them their sacred money to buy for yourself some extra pleasure, some added comfort? Could you take, without shame, the place of a real worker, you, one of the privileged, you, who have a husband a home-life modest but secure, you who accomplish your feminine destiny according to nature and reason.

"My child, I will not help you against the interest of other women less fortunate than yourself. I will not betray their interests to satisfy your caprice. Return to your husband's house; superintend your household; make, if necessary, your dresses and hats; learn to be ingenious and economical like most French women who know how to make a great deal out of nothing and something out of nothing at all. Go home and thank fate which has given you for husband this good fellow who would think you crazy if he could hear you. And would to God we could be delivered of the amateurs who take up painting, literature, even stenography. Down with the unpaid secretary, the improvised journalist who amuse themselves by work, the novelist who pays the publisher instead of being paid by him and all the other trade spoilers!"

And Mme. Finayre adds that the workers who are worthy of sympathy and respect are those who work to live or who work from true vocation without consideration of pay. The rest would be better occupied in cultivating their minds if they have nothing to do at home.

MARCELLE FINAYRE ON MATERNITY

"The childless homes of France are to be deplored. Women are not much encouraged to become mothers because maternity has come to be regarded as a sort of disgrace—a yoke—to the small group of blasé people who form the fashions, those of dress and those of ideas. * * * When maternity comes to be respected, when it adds a grace, an aureole to young mothers, then the styles will no longer be designed to suggest boyish outlines instead of feminine ones." This can only come about when the women themselves come to see in maternity their highest mission. At present they are misled by suffrage teaching into regarding it as "an interruption" of more important business. One suffragist speaks of it as "an interruption of only a few weeks." The denial of femininity is just what the Feminist movement means and the styles have followed the movement. It is quite true that if maternity were ever to become the fashion the present styles would change, for maternity means figures more on the order of Niobe than of the suffragette. The ideal mother is not a poster girl nor yet a female politician. It would be a pleasant change to see the little, wayward, boyish-looking girl of the period striving to look calm and developed and restful and maternal.

Marcelle Finayre continues: "The modern woman is just the instinctive little animal who does not think, who scarcely loves, and who never bears children. She is a doll without soul or depth. Who can describe the touching beauty of the young mother?"

MME. FINAYRE ON LOVE AND THE MODERN WOMAN

A suffragist lately made the thoughtless remark that men had better "look out" as "modern women were learning to live without love." Mme. Finayre's intelligence is of so lucid and logical a quality that she is certain to think herself out of Suffrage as she has thought herself out of many of its associated fallacies. This is what she says of love and the modern woman:

"For the modern woman when love fails, everything fails. She does not believe in the rewards of eternal life, nor in the ineffable consolation of the presence of God. She endures the sterile pain of living with disgust. Even her purity, defended from the covetousness of men, saved from all snares and pitfalls, does not any longer appear as heavenly virtue. She is no longer proud of being as a lily. And it is sufficient for work to grow slack or poverty threaten, or health to alter, for this woman without love or child to seek rest in the impure bed of the Seine.

"Many women die thus each year, not from sentimental despair, nor from actual want but because life is unsupportable and because they know to-morrow will be only a continuation of yesterday. One cannot say they die. They merely exchange one nothingness for another."

There is no danger whatever that modern woman will learn to live without love. The danger is that she may die without it, or that a few misguided ones may attempt, like Mary Woolstoncraft or Meta Sinclair, to live without its safeguards. Mary Woolstoncraft, too, "sought rest" in the Seine and accepted marriage at least for the sake of security, though without altering her so-called convictions.

THE SUFFRAWOCKY

'Twas *belmont* and the *annashaw*
  Did *lockwood* on the *blatchford* way—
All *rosyjones lafolletted*
  And *mussey duniway.*

Beware the suffragette, my son,
  The *gilman* voice, the eyes of flame;
And more than *wiley* trouserette
  Beware the frilly dame.

He took the 'lection poll in hand,
  Long time the *hutton* foe he sought;
Then rested he by the *colby* tree
  And *mackayed* there in thought.

And as in *sylvia* thought he stood,
  The militant with rock concealed,
Came *cristobelling* through the wood
  And *pankhurst* 'til she reeled.

One, two! Two, three! came *ellenkey,*
  A-*clark*ing for the fight;
As *schreiner pauled* in *hill*ish glee
  And slew the parasite.

"And hast thou slain the *chapmancatt?*
  Come to my arms, *millholland* boy!
Oh, *hinckly* girl with *kenty* curl!"
  He *harpered* in his joy.

'Twas *belmont* and the *annashaw*
  Did *lockwood* on the *blatchford* way;
All *rosyjones lafolletted*
  And *mussey duniway.*

ADELE M. BALLARD,
Seattle, Washington.

London "Punch" says: "We have seldom heard of a more excellent idea than that of the New York Suffragettes, who have decided to ride on horseback to San Francisco. Mr. Punch's heartiest moral support will be given to such London militants as decide to attempt something on the same lines. A pilgrimage to, say, Peru, if they took their time over it and did not hurry their return, would surely be wonderfully impressive."

The Vice-Chancellor of Oxford has expressed the desire that the play "Phyl," written by Miss Cicely Hamilton, one of the leading English Suffragists, shall not be given in that place.

HOW SUFFRAGISTS AID TEMPERANCE!

The New York Sunday *Herald*, of recent date, contained the following news article:

DENVER, COL. — Saturday. — Alderman O'Driscoll, the chivalrous lawmaker who would save the fair women of Denver from the clutches of Demon Rum, is still hearing from the women, who one and all refused to be saved.

The Colorado Equal Suffrage Association, through Mrs. Katherine Williamson, chairman of the Resolutions Committee, addressed this letter to the City Council concerning the O'Driscoll bill to prohibit café owners from serving "females" with intoxicating drinks:

"TO THE HONORABLE COUNCIL OF THE CITY AND COUNTY OF DENVER:

"*Gentlemen:* The following resolution was passed by the Colorado Equal Suffrage Association at its last meeting, and is herewith presented to your honorable body with the request that its provisions be granted:

"Whereas, The Colorado Equal Suffrage Association believes that men and women are equal before the law as citizens, and that any laws, either local or State, discriminating between men and women are a violation of the constitutions of State and nation, a restriction of the liberty of women citizens and their constitutional rights as citizens and constitutes class legislation; and,

"Whereas, The Colorado Equal Suffrage Association stands for a single standard of morals for men and women and is irrevocably opposed to any legislation, either local or State, that tends to establish a double standard of morals, which the world over has always been a contributing cause of immorality; therefore be it

"Resolved, That the Colorado Equal Suffrage Association begs your honorable body to defeat by your votes the O'Driscoll bill which provides that it shall be a misdemeanor for proprietors to serve liquor to their women patrons."

Yet Suffragists with this record of official opinion before them have the impudence (no other word will serve) to accuse Anti-Suffragists of being "in league with the liquor dealers."

Putting this aside, however, as of small importance, our serious consideration is as to where such resolutions can lead. We have heard much of the "purification" that women would bring to politics and we have answered that, on the contrary, politics would bring degradation to women. These resolutions confirm our view. Moreover, these resolutions demand the abolition of all privilege and protection to women. Let anyone who subscribes to such an uncivilized and inhuman policy be a Suffragist. Anti-Suffragists unhesitatingly condemn it.

And now to show the unmitigated and ridiculous inconsistency of which this most senseless and formless movement is guilty. At the very time that the Colorado Equal Suffrage Association is demanding "equal opportunity" in regard to drinks and is scoring men with scorn who dare to deny it, Senator Helen Robinson is denouncing in the Colorado Senate the statement attributed to Senator Hecker that the women of his State drink more cocktails and highballs than the men as "an insult to the women of Colorado." Senator Helen Robinson threatens Senator Hecker with "expulsion from the Senate" if he dares to repeat such a charge. But why? Surely "equal opportunity" is an idle phrase if no advantage is taken of it. When colleges were thrown open to women many women availed themselves of the opportunity. Why otherwise should they wish them opened? The Colorado Suffrage Association passes resolutions in the name of equal rights and an equally low moral standard, demanding that all saloons shall be open to women. Doubtless results will follow here, too, and Senator Hecker says the women are showing themselves men's equals, in some cases superior in capacity of consumption. That Suffragist who reassured the liquor men by saying that they "had nothing to fear from Suffrage" was certainly right. No saloons are likely to be closed in Colorado.

What Anti-Suffragists are trying seriously and conscientiously to point out is that though opening the colleges was good, opening the saloons is bad. We claim that the Suffrage movement has lost its sanity and has become reckless, lawless and degenerate. Each movement has in itself the seed of destruction and the Suffrage seed is growing with immense rapidity. But the danger is not now so much that Suffrage will sweep the country as that it will injure other women as it is injuring those of Colorado by lowering their standards. Without achieving man's virtues, women are content to copy their vices. As to the advantage to future generations in the resolutions proposed and accepted by the Denver Suffrage Association, it is difficult to see where that comes in.

J. T. W.

HOW SUFFRAGIST AIDS WORKING WOMEN

And now for an instance which I fear would make the cynic shake with mirth. I am going to tell now of a Modern Martyr, one of those women who quite honestly imagine they are furthering the Cause of Women, and thereby the world, by first exciting the basest, wildest passions of humanity and then hurtling their bodies blindly into the maelström. They quite honestly—oh, I am sure, quite honestly—imagine things will be altered when women have the Vote! They may be: they certainly will have to be considerably altered before they get it. A lot of spade-work has to be done yet in the uplifting of humanity.

This woman was one of those who had been pleasure-loving, frivolous and thoughtless before the wave caught her; and its influence was certainly amazing. It transformed her into a member of an intensely democratic sisterhood which embraced all the women who needed Justice and Freedom: and, be it said in all good faith, they are no inconsiderable number. The Vote was to give them both. There were to be no underpaid workers then. Sweated labor was to be the root-evil attacked, and swept away directly "votes for women" were obtained. It would never be touched till then, because they were so convinced that men were proved and known extortioners, insensate in their greed and tyranny. Not till women had the power would their sisters be rescued. I am by no means saying there is not a grain of truth in this assumption. But this woman magnified this assumption till it became her only thought. When the waves of hysteria foamed at public meetings, she threw in bags of money, jewels, and wrote unheard-of checks. She gave up servants, reduced every personal expense; prison was, of course, a cherished goal, and her entire days were devoted to propaganda.

She felt a fierce exultant triumph that her father had died without a son and that she had come into his wealth. She was still young, but the old life of smart clubs and house-parties, of golf meetings and tennis tournaments, of yachting and Swiss sports and the Riviera, held no more attraction. She was cited as an example.

She held many shares in many companies. Business had always been a terrifying bogey, and her plunge into politics left her no time for anything but the main issue. So she continued to fling into the exchequer of the Cause the profits from what is probably the most notorious sweating firm in Great Britain, the worst offenders in the living-in system, whose women employees obtain so far below a living wage that the quarters in which the firm's imposing establishments are situated are marked with a black ring in certain maps of cities.—(From article on "Good Women Who Foster Infamous Concerns," in *Woman's Magazine.*

The first colored woman's organization opposed to woman suffrage has been formed in Boston, with Mrs. Mary J. Henderson as chairman.

The red flag of socialism was carried in the District of Columbia for the first time at the recent woman suffrage parade there, when it bore the words "1,000,000 socialists are working and voting for woman suffrage."

WHY I DO NOT WANT TO VOTE
By Mrs. A. J. George

Never before has it been proposed to extend the franchise to a new electorate, the majority of whom are either indifferent or opposed to it.

I am not afraid of the masculine woman, but I have grave fears for the woman who confuses the work of man and woman and attempts to do both.

There is reason that we should consider the situation in England. Does the deliberate destruction of property and the creation of public disorder promise that women are to show a more excellent way in government?

Suffragists claim that woman suffrage is necessary to abolish the hideous white slave traffic. The Federal law, known as the Mann act, is being rapidly applied. Other laws must and will follow.

It is the greatest power and pressing danger of our woman's temperament that we cannot have differences of opinion and treat them impersonally, as men do.

It is no answer to say that the men have failed. If they are doing so poorly, what shall we say of the women who have trained them? We have made the men what they are. Our need to-day is not more voters, but better voters.

There is no limitation to woman's opportunity to-day, save the limitations imposed by her physical and nervous constitution, and there we have a stone wall—not of prejudice, as some would make us think, but of nature's own building.

The history of the woman suffrage movement shows that the ballot is not necessary to secure woman's legal and civil rights. Consider the laws affecting women in your own State, all of which have been secured without woman's vote.

If you are to use men's clumsy methods, you will be a part of the political machine, and you will be divided into Democrats and Republicans, and Socialists, and Prohibitionists, precisely as men are, and as you are to-day threatened with division by the politics of suffrage.

The only consistent suffragist to-day is the woman who has the courage to follow her theories to their ultimate conclusion, and who stands for the so-called economic independence of woman, even to the co-responsibility of the wife for the maintenance of her children, if she has any. This is the socialistic view.

While Suffragists are talking about the passing of the home and the dawn of an era when baby gardens shall precede kindergartens, and the State shall take care of the child, experts affirm that what the child needs even more than sanitary conditions is mothering, and that the morals and the health of the child are safer in a poor home than in a good institution.

It is not by the establishment nor by the suppression of institutions that social change is wrought—you may suppress the saloon, but unless the public conscience is aroused, the liquor traffic is unchecked. It is by reform within the individual that the kingdom of God is advanced. To-day we have lost our clearer vision of this truth and, forgetting the power of character, invoke the power of the law.

A woman before the Massachusetts legislature pleaded for the ballot in order that the theatrical billboard displays might not offend the eyes of youth. She lacked nothing in zeal, but her knowledge of fact was lacking, for it is true that 85 per cent. of the patrons of the theater are women. Obviously the most direct and simple way to raise the standard of the stage is to make the box-office receipts voice our protest against the violation of decency, of modesty and the corruption of youth.

COMMON WELFARE
By Bradley Welch

The organization of society known as Government is an overhead charge—a tax on individual time and energy for the sake of benefits won thereby. It is clear that the smaller this tax the more we have left for the real ends of life. Obviously an omniscient and benevolent monarchy would be the best form of Government. But a monarchy can not be omniscient, and even if it were benevolent humanity is not sufficiently generous to believe it.

An oligarchy, for special reasons belonging to the nature of clique, is probably worse and it is not until we come down to a fairly democratic or at least representative Government that the interests of all individuals and of all groups are sufficiently represented. Beyond this it is unnecessary and unwise to go.

There is no native inherent right for the individual as opposed to the greater rights of the community. Society owes to no one, either man or woman, the right of suffrage. Its only duty to the individual is that it shall not oppress, or what is the same thing, that it shall offer all possible freedom.

The question is therefore not one of right but of common welfare, and there is very little to show that the common welfare will be promoted by any extension of suffrage, either to women or to men under 21. If it may be argued that the moral nature of women would make them more ethical in their use of the ballot, the retort is very nearly as strong, that their lesser average contact with practical life and their mental processes which are at present intuitive rather than rational, neutralizes such an advantage.

Man is little enough fitted for Government, but such as he is, his strength is *outgoing*, and that of woman is *indwelling* —a distinction for governmental purposes all in favor of the man.

Even in the absence of the franchise comparatively few women are *unrepresented* in Government, and if they do not exert a sufficient influence it is because they do not trouble to make the attempt. If they are without influence lacking a ballot, it argues ill for the intelligence with which they will *use* the ballot.

Any considerable group of people in the midst of our political institutions can get any proper measure they desire. Women can undoubtedly get the ballot if they want it, but it will be a pity if the few desiring it thrust on the many an obligation neither desired nor understood.

NOTES AND COMMENT

What the American woman needs is not to abolish her privileges but to accept her responsibilities.

Women are now racing in motors from one end of the country to another to prove that they have no freedom.

Arctic exploration offers a splendid outlet for Suffragist energies. It is a better test of courage and endurance than walking to Albany.

The power to destroy is common to the vandal, the anarchist and the Suffragette and by no means implies the power to reconstruct.

SALT LAKE CITY, Feb. 19.—Every citizen of Utah who is eligible to vote, but who does not exercise the right, will be compelled to pay a poll tax of $3 under the terms of a bill passed by the Senate to-day. The tax will be assessed against women as well as men.

At a large public meeting in Washington, held the day before the suffrage parade, Harriet Stanton Blatch announced that the Antis were "abominable hypocrites" and "miserable lying Antis." It is interesting to know whom she meant. Did she mean Senator Root, Dr. Lyman Abbot, Charles S. Fairchild, James Bryce, Prof. G. T. Ladd, Prof. W. T. Sedgwick and other men of that caliber? Or did she mean Jeannette Gilder, Kate Douglas Wiggin, Mrs. James Codman, Mrs. John Hay, Mrs. Philip Sheridan and Mrs. Thomas Marshall? Or did the lady just lose her temper?

G. K. Chesterton finds it rather amusing that Mrs. Pankhurst objects to the referendum being used to decide the question of Woman Suffrage on the ground that it is "tricky" and "unconstitutional." The last phrase of his clever article covers the whole ground: "We shall not advance an inch in any of the arguments of to-day till people can be induced to see that a word can only be used as a spell, or even as a curse, so long as we keep it sacred. The party wall will not keep your neighbor out of your garden unless it keeps you out of your neighbor's garden. If you undermine it for your own purposes you undermine it quite as much for his. If you break it down with a pick-axe to let yourself through, you break it down to let him through. There is nothing in this universe that expands infinitely. If there were and it were only a dandelion, it would long ago have killed the universe. Things expand and contract—lungs, livers, hearts, empires; in fact, as the schoolboy said of the long summer days, things expand in the heat and contract in the cold. As the case of the Turkish Empire shows, the things that cannot stop expanding are the things that cannot stop contracting. The only remedy against either extreme is to have a frontier, and to keep it fixed; fixed for oneself as well as for the other party. And so, if Mrs. Pankhurst is so terrified of an unconstitutional appeal to democracy, she had better not defy the constitution—supposing she can find any to defy."

There is a type of Suffragist who uses the argument that Suffrage would be a better occupation for idle women than bridge or talking scandal. But voting as a substitute for bridge has serious drawbacks. Its consequences are farther reaching. In short, government ought not to be strictly speaking so much an amusement for the idle as a responsibility for the competent. No one claims that our present government is entirely satisfactory, but to turn it over to the bridge-playing women as a new excitement will hardly improve matters. This view of the question always reminds me of a little poem we knew as children called "The Toy of the Giant's Child," in which a little giantess took a peasant with his plow and horses to play with, and her father, the good giant, rebuked her by saying: "The peasant is no plaything, child." It is possible that the child would not harm the peasant but the point of view is wrong, since neither government nor human beings are playthings to be picked up and tossed aside. Besides which, it is just as reasonable to argue that idle women should take up bridge building instead of bridge playing. The sole difference would be that many of us might be willing to take a hand in their game who would not care to trust to their trestles. Government affects us all. Hence, though women are completely justified in exacting many reforms and improvements, they alienate sympathy when they ask to do that which cannot improve the situation and must complicate it.

J. T. W.

"The Nature of Woman"
By Lionel Tayler
Review by Mrs. John Martin

The writer of this interesting book, an English lecturer on biology, found his inspiration for it in the chance reading of a forgotten essay on "Woman," by W. C. Roscoe, which appeared in the October number of the *National Review* in the year 1858.

"In this essay," writes Mr. Tayler, "every argument of real strength for and against the woman's movement that has been used in the fifty odd years that have followed its publication will be found summarized. That so able a statement excited so little comment is truly remarkable.

"There are many phases of industry," he declares further, "which are totally unfitted for woman. So far from it being desirable that she should learn from experience the difficulties with which man has to contend, it is to be wished that her atmosphere should be as serene and her growth as unwarped as the conditions of humanity will allow."

The teaching which Mr. Tayler wishes especially to emphasize is that society must learn to assign the respective occupations of men and women in accordance with *no other consideration* than that which is consonant with the life of the true man and the true woman. And he points out that at the bottom of woman's widespread discontent lies a subtle realization, that, severed from home life with all its associations, its hopes and its duties, she is losing the consciousness (no matter how numerous and pressing her other interests and obligations may be) of having a true purpose in life.

The different ways in which men and women react upon each other, for good or ill, seems to have been treated by Mr. Roscoe with keenness and subtlety. When the sexes, he declares, are drawn together by the affections—moral and intellectual as well as physical—the effect upon them is that each sex is reinforced in its own best qualities. Man becomes more manly; woman more womanly.

But when they approach each other on neutral ground, with an eye to business, their association is attended not by respective gain, but by respective loss. A lessened harmony, followed by a spirit of antagonism, is engendered.

Because of her greater susceptibility, this mutual injury is felt more keenly by woman than by man. "Business women are harder than men and more unscrupulous. Fisherwomen rougher than fishermen; the fallen woman more irretrievably lost than the fallen man, and so on."

His conclusion is that "woman's life will be expanded only when she becomes conscious that she has a mental and bodily individuality, and is content to work within it and through it to a self-realized life that has obeyed the healthy calls of her own being."

The writer's scientific training ensures a rigid restraint in his handling of this difficult subject, but the book is the more suggestive and valuable because of it, and is admirably adapted to reinforce the fundamental beliefs of the anti-suffrage.

THE NEW YORK STATE ASSOCIATION OPPOSED TO WOMAN SUFFRAGE

FOUNDED 1895

Printed matter can be secured by application to the Secretary at the office of the Association, 35 West 39th Street, New York City.

Complete set 50 cts. Single copies 5 cts.

PAMPHLETS

Woman and the Law — By *Francis M. Scott*
Address Before Constitutional Convention, 1894 — By *Hon. Elihu Root*
First Address Before the New York Legislature, 1895 — By *Mrs. Francis M. Scott*
The Problem of Woman Suffrage — By *Adeline Knapp*
Woman's Rights in America — By *Mrs. Caroline F. Corbin*
A Talk to Women on the Suffrage Question — By *Miss Emily P. Bissell*
Wages and the Ballot — By *Mary Dean Adams*
Should We Ask for the Suffrage? — By *Mrs. Schuyler Van Rensselaer*
How Women Can Best Serve the State — By *Mrs. Barclay Hazard*
The Blank Cartridge Ballot — By *Rossiter Hazard*
Taxation and Suffrage — By *Frederick Dwight*
Real Opponents to the Suffrage Movement — By *Edward W. Bok*
The Relation of the Sexes to Government — By *Prof. Edward D. Cope*
Do Working Women Need the Ballot? — By *Adeline Knapp*
Woman's Progress Versus Woman Suffrage — By *Helen Kendrick Johnson*
What Women Have Actually Done Where They Vote — By *Richard Barry*
Woman's Relation to Government — By *Mrs. William Forse Scott*
The Legal Status of Women — By *Mrs. Francis M. Scott*
Feminism — By *Prof. Dr. Melchinor Palagyi*
Woman Suffrage and Child Labor Legislation — By *Miss Minnie Bronson*
Woman's Rights vs. Woman Suffrage — *Mrs. A. J. George*
Woman Suffrage Means Debasement Not Only of Women but of Men — *Mr. John R. Dos Passos*
Woman Suffrage in Finland
New Zealand and Australia from an Anti-Suffrage Point of View
The Voice of the People
Suffragists Desert Philanthropy
Woman Suffrage and the Equal Guardianship Law

BOOKS RECOMMENDED FOR READING

On Suffrage (0.5) — *G. K. Chesterton*
Votes for Women (.10) — *Frederic Harrison*
Woman Adrift ($1.50) — *Harold Owen*
The Nature of Woman ($1.25) — *J. Lionel Tayler*
The Business of Being a Woman ($1.50) — *Ida Tarbell*
The Ladies' Battle ($1.00) — *Molly Elliott Seawell*
Book of Woman's Power ($1.25)
Anti-Suffrage: Ten Good Reasons (50c.) — *Grace Duffield Goodwin*
Woman and the Republic (25c.) — *Mrs. Rossiter Johnson*

Anti-Suffrage Calendar for 1911, with many interesting quotations. These can be obtained by applying to
THE WOMAN'S PROTEST.

We recommend to our readers the new Monthly, THE COMMON CAUSE, which is opposed to Socialism. Subscription $2.00. Office, 154 East 23d Street, N. Y. Also, THE REMONSTRANCE; subscription, 50 cents; 687 Boylston St., Boston, Mass.

Some pamphlets issued by the Massachusetts Association Opposed to the Further Extension of Suffrage to Women:

Some of the Reasons Against Woman Suffrage — *Francis Parkman*
Of What Benefit to Woman?
Why I Am Opposed to Woman Suffrage — *Jeannette L. Gilder*
Letter to Legislative Committee — *Mrs. Clara T. Leonard*
Argument Before Committee — *Mrs. Kate Gannett Wells*
Municipal Suffrage for Women—Why? — *Frank Foxcraft*
Taxpaying Suffrage — *Charles R. Saunders*
The Wage-earning Woman and the State — *Minnie Bronson*
Rights and Exemptions Given by Massachusetts Law to Women and Not to Men
Opinions of Eminent Persons Against Woman Suffrage
In Opposition to the Further Extension of Suffrage to Women (a List of Massachusetts Men)
Woman's Power and Woman Suffrage — *Ida M. Tarbell*

Pamphlets and Leaflets may be obtained
from the Secretary of the Association
KENSINGTON BUILDING, Room 615
687 Boylston Street, BOSTON, MASS.

THE WOMAN'S PROTEST

.....1913

The National Association Opposed to Woman Suffrage
35 West 39th Street, New York City

Enclosed find $.....for.....year's subscription

Name .....

Street .....

City .....State.....

Subscription Rate *$1.00* a year. Make checks payable to THE WOMAN'S PROTEST.

If you wish to subscribe for a friend, write the name below and include the amount in your remittance.

Name .....

Street .....

City .....

State .....